



TITLE:

# COVERING PROPERTIES CHARACTERIZED BY ORTHOCOMPACTNESS AND SUBNORMALITY OF PRODUCTS(Set-theoretic Topology and Geometric Topology)

AUTHOR(S):

YAJIMA, YUKINOBU

---

CITATION:

YAJIMA, YUKINOBU. COVERING PROPERTIES CHARACTERIZED BY ORTHOCOMPACTNESS AND SUBNORMALITY OF PRODUCTS(Set-theoretic Topology and Geometric Topology). 数理解析研究所講究録 1995, 901: 14-20

ISSUE DATE:

1995-03

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/59378>

RIGHT:

## COVERING PROPERTIES CHARACTERIZED BY ORTHOCOMPACTNESS AND SUBNORMALITY OF PRODUCTS

YUKINOBU YAJIMA (矢島幸信)

Department of Mathematics, Kanagawa University

All spaces are assumed to be  $T_1$ , but compact spaces and paracompact spaces are assumed to be Hausdorff.

A space  $X$  is assumed to be Tychonoff when we consider the product  $X \times \gamma X$ , where  $\gamma X$  denotes a compactification of  $X$ . An infinite cardinal  $\kappa$  is assumed to be no less than  $L(X)$  when we consider the product  $X \times 2^\kappa$  or the product  $X \times (\kappa + 1)$ , where  $L(X)$  denotes the Lindelöf number of the space  $X$ .

The main purpose of this note is to give some partial answers to Problems A and C stated in Section 1.

### 1. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF COVERING PROPERTIES BY PRODUCTS

Let us begin with a classical result of Dowker [D].

**Theorem 1.1** [D]. *For a normal space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X$  is countably paracompact.
- (b)  $X \times (\omega + 1)$  is normal.
- (c)  $X \times [0, 1]$  is normal.

Theorem 1.1 is the first result which indicated an important implication between covering properties and products. Moreover, this led up to a beautiful characterization of paracompactness in terms of products.

**Theorem 1.2** [T,M]. *For a Hausdorff space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X$  is paracompact.
- (b)  $X \times \gamma X$  is normal.
- (c)  $X \times 2^\kappa$  is normal.
- (d)  $X \times (\kappa + 1)$  is normal.

*Remark.* The equivalence (a) and (d) in Theorem 1.2 was proved by Kunen. It is found in [P, Corollary 3.7].

An open cover  $\mathcal{V}$  of a space  $X$  is *interior-preserving* if  $\bigcap \mathcal{V}'$  is open in  $X$  for each  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$ . A space  $X$  is *orthocompact* if every open cover of  $X$  has an interior-preserving open refinement.

Subsequently, as a nice analogue of Theorem 1.2, a characterization of metacompactness was obtained as follows.

**Theorem 1.3** [Ju1,S]. *For a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X$  is metacompact.
- (b)  $X \times \gamma X$  is orthocompact.
- (c)  $X \times 2^\kappa$  is orthocompact.

This means that there are some closed relations between normality and orthocompactness of products (see [S,KY]). Moreover, as an analogue of Theorem 1.3, we proved a characterization of submetacompactness as follows.

**Theorem 1.4** [Y1]. *For a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X$  is submetacompact.
- (b)  $X \times \gamma X$  is suborthocompact.
- (c)  $X \times 2^\kappa$  is suborthocompact.

Seeing Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, it is natural to raise the following problem.

**Problem A** [Y2]. If  $X \times (\kappa + 1)$  is orthocompact, is  $X$  metacompact ?

Moreover, it is natural to ask whether there is an analogical characterization of subparacompactness in terms of products.

Recall that a space  $X$  is *subnormal* [C, Kr] (*normal*) if for any disjoint closed sets  $A$  and  $B$  in  $X$ , there are disjoint  $G_\delta$ -sets (open sets)  $G$  and  $H$  such that  $A \subset G$  and  $B \subset H$ . Note that a space  $X$  is subnormal (normal) if and only if every binary open cover of  $X$  has a countable (finite) closed refinement.

**Problem B** [Ju3]. If  $X \times \gamma X$  is subnormal, is  $X$  subparacompact ?

**Problem C** [Y2]. If  $X \times 2^\kappa$  is subnormal, is  $X$  subparacompact ?

*Remark.* As is shown later, it suffices for these three problems to prove that  $X$  is submetacompact. In fact, this follows from Lemma 2.9 and Theorem 3.3 (or Corollary 3.5) below.

## 2. METACOMPACTNESS AND SUBMETACOMPACTNESS OF $\beta$ -SPACES

In this section, we give an affirmative answer to our Problem A under the assumption of  $X$  being a  $\beta$ -space.

A space  $X$  is called a  $\beta$ -space if there is a function  $g: X \times \omega \rightarrow \text{Top}(X)$ , satisfying

- (i)  $x \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} g(x, n)$ ,
- (ii) if  $x \in g(x_n, n)$  for each  $n \in \omega$ , then  $\{x_n\}$  has a cluster point in  $X$ .

Since the class of  $\beta$ -spaces contains the classes of  $\Sigma$ -spaces and semi-stratifiable spaces, it is very broad as a class of generalized metric spaces.

A well-ordered sequence  $\{y_\alpha: \alpha \in \kappa\}$  of length  $\kappa$  in a space  $Y$  is a *free sequence* if  $\text{Cl}\{y_\beta: \beta < \alpha\} \cap \text{Cl}\{y_\gamma: \alpha \leq \gamma < \kappa\} = \emptyset$  for each  $\alpha \in \kappa$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $X$  be a  $\beta$ -space and  $C$  a compact space with a free sequence of length  $\geq L(X)$ . Then  $X$  is metacompact if and only if  $X \times C$  is orthocompact.*

Since  $\kappa + 1$  has a free sequence of length  $\kappa$ , Theorem 2.1 yields a partial answer to Problem A.

**Corollary 2.2.** *A  $\beta$ -space  $X$  is metacompact if and only if  $X \times (\kappa + 1)$  is orthocompact.*

Moreover, Arhangel'skii's theorem in [A] and Theorem 2.1 yield

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $X$  be a  $\beta$ -space and  $C$  a compact space with tightness  $> L(X)$ . Then  $X$  is metacompact if and only if  $X \times C$  is orthocompact.*

Now, we will give only a course of the proof of Theorem 2.1. On the way, we will obtain a characterization of submetacompactness of  $\beta$ -spaces.

A well-ordered open cover  $\{U_\alpha: \alpha \in \kappa\}$  of a space  $X$  is *well-monotone* if  $\beta < \alpha$  implies  $U_\beta \subset U_\alpha$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $X$  be a space and  $C$  a compact space with a free sequence of length  $\geq L(X)$ . If  $X \times C$  is orthocompact, then every well-monotone open cover of  $X$  has a closure-preserving closed refinement.*

By this, it seems to be effective to consider well-monotone open covers and their closure-preserving closed refinements. So we think of the following Junnila's theorem.

**Theorem 2.5** [Ju1, Ju2]. *The following are equivalent for a space  $X$ .*

- (a)  $X$  is metacompact (submetacompact).
- (b) Every well-monotone open cover of  $X$  has a point-finite open refinement ( $\theta$ -sequence of open refinements).
- (c) Every interior-preserving directed open cover of  $X$  has a  $(\sigma)$ -closure-preserving closed refinement.

Seeing Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.5, we raise the following problem.

**Problem D.** *If every well-monotone open cover of a space  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving closed refinement, when is  $X$  submetacompact?*

**Lemma 2.6** [Ji]. Let  $X$  be a  $\beta$ -space and  $\mathcal{U}$  a well-monotone open cover of  $X$ . If  $\mathcal{H}$  is an open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ , then there is a sequence  $\{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H},s} : s \in \omega^{<\omega}\}$  of partial refinements by open sets in  $X$ , satisfying

- (1)  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H},s} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H},s'}$  for  $s \subset s'$ ,
- (2) if  $x \in X$  with  $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{H}) \leq n$ , then  $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H},s}$  for each  $s \in \omega^{n+1}$ ,
- (3) for each  $x \in X$ , there is some  $\sigma \in \omega^\omega$  such that  $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H},(\sigma \upharpoonright n)}) < \omega$  for each  $n \in \omega$ .

Making use of this, we prove the following lemma. A basic idea for the proof is also due to Jiang [Ji].

**Lemma 2.7** (main). Let  $X$  be a  $\beta$ -space and  $\mathcal{U}$  a well-monotone open cover of  $X$ . If  $\mathcal{U}$  has a closure-preserving closed refinement, then it has a  $\theta$ -sequence of open refinements.

By Lemma 2.7, we can easily obtain an answer to our Problem D.

**Theorem 2.8.** A  $\beta$ -space  $X$  is submetacompact if and only if every well-monotone open cover of  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving closed refinement.

Now, let us return the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Let  $X$  be a space and  $\mathcal{F}$  a collection of subsets of  $X$ . A collection  $\{G(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$  of subsets in  $X$  is an *open expansion* (a  $G_\delta$ -*expansion*) if  $G(F)$  is an open set (a  $G_\delta$ -set) in  $X$  such that  $F \subset G(F)$  for each  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .

A space  $X$  is *almost expandable* [SK] if every locally finite collection of closed sets in  $X$  has a point-finite open expansion.

A well-ordered sequence  $\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$  of length  $\kappa$  in a space  $Y$  is *right separated* if  $y_\alpha \notin \text{Cl}\{y_\delta : \delta > \alpha\}$  for each  $\alpha \in \kappa$ . Note that each free sequence is right separated.

**Lemma 2.9.** Let  $X$  be a space and  $C$  a compact space with a right separated sequence of length  $\geq L(X)$ . If  $X \times C$  is orthocompact, then  $X$  is almost expandable.

Since submetacompact, almost expandable spaces are metacompact (see [SK]), Theorem 2.1 follows from Lemmas 2.4 and 2.9, and Theorem 2.8.  $\square$

As a similar problem to Problem D, we raise

**Problem D'.** If every well-monotone open cover of an orthocompact space  $X$  has a closure-preserving closed refinement, is  $X$  metacompact ?

If problem D' would be affirmatively solved, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that Problem A would be affirmative.

Concerning Problem D', we get an additional result.

**Lemma 2.10** [HV, Theorem 3.1]. *For a (an orthocompact) space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *For every well-monotone open cover  $\{U_\alpha: \alpha \in \kappa\}$  of  $X$ , there is a well-monotone closed cover  $\{F_\alpha: \alpha \in \kappa\}$  of  $X$  such that  $F_\alpha \subset U_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in \kappa$ .*
- (b) *Every well-monotone open cover of  $X$  has a cushioned (closure-preserving) closed refinement.*
- (c) *Every infinite open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  has an open refinement  $\mathcal{V}$  with  $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}) < |\mathcal{U}|$  for each  $x \in X$ .*

Let  $(\lambda + 1)_\lambda$  denote the space  $\lambda + 1$  with the topology such that the point  $\lambda$  has a neighborhood base in the usual order topology and that all other points are isolated.

Using Lemma 2.10, we obtain

**Theorem 2.11.** *For an orthocompact space  $X$ , every well-monotone open cover of  $X$  has a closure-preserving closed refinement if and only if  $X \times (\lambda + 1)_\lambda$  is orthocompact for each  $\lambda (\leq L(X))$ .*

We close this section with the following two unsolved problems, which seem to be related to Problems D and D'.

**Problem E** [Ka, Y1]. *If every directed open cover of a (suborthocompact) space  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -cushioned closed refinement, is  $X$  submetacompact ?*

**Problem E'** [Ka, Ju3]. *If every directed open cover of a space  $X$  has a cushioned closed refinement, is  $X$  metacompact ?*

Problem E' was affirmatively solved under the assumption of  $X$  being suborthocompact (see [Y1]).

### 3. COUNTABLE SUBPARACOMPACTNESS

In this section, we give some partial answers to our Problem C.

A space  $X$  is *countably subparacompact* [Kr] if every countable open cover of  $X$  has a countable closed refinement. Note that countably subparacompact spaces are, equivalently, countably metacompact and subnormal (see [Kr, Theorem 2.5]).

Recently, a list of analogues of Theorem 1.1 was given in [GT, p.118]. Here we can add another analogue, answering to Problem C in the case of  $\kappa = \omega$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *For a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  *$X$  is countably subparacompact.*
- (b)  *$X \times 2^\omega$  is subnormal.*
- (c)  *$X \times [0, 1]$  is subnormal.*

*Remark 1.* The equivalence of (a) and (c) in Theorem 3.1 was stated in [GT, p.127] without proof. However, at the 10th Summer Conference on General Topology and Application (Amsterdam, August 1994), Good and Tree kindly informed the author that this equivalence had *not* been proved yet, because they misunderstood the proof.

Theorem 3.1 immediately yields a generalization of Theorem 1.1.

**Corollary 3.2.** *For a normal space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X$  is countably paracompact.
- (b)  $X \times (\omega + 1)$  is normal.
- (c)  $X \times [0, 1]$  is subnormal.

*Remark 2.* It should be noticed that Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 are essentially different from all the analogues in the list of [GT, p.118]. Because we can replace  $[0, 1]$  with  $\omega + 1$  in all of them, but we cannot do in Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2. In fact, consider a Dowker space  $Y$ , whose existence is assured by Rudin [R1]. Since the product of a subnormal space and a countable space is subnormal,  $Y \times (\omega + 1)$  is subnormal. On the other hand,  $Y$  is normal, but not countably metacompact.

A space  $X$  is *collectionwise  $\delta$ -normal* [Ju3] if every discrete collection of closed sets in  $X$  has a disjoint  $G_\delta$ -expansion.

**Theorem 3.3** [R2]. *Let  $X$  be a space and  $C$  a compact space with weight  $\geq L(X)$ . If  $X \times C$  is subnormal, then  $X$  is collectionwise  $\delta$ -normal.*

A space  $X$  is *collectionwise subnormal* [C, Kr] if for each discrete collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of closed sets in  $X$ , there is a sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$  of open expansions of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that for each  $x \in X$ , there is some  $n \in \omega$  such that at most one member of  $\mathcal{U}_n$  contains  $x$ . Note “subparacompact  $\Rightarrow$  collectionwise subnormal  $\Rightarrow$  collectionwise  $\delta$ -normal”.

Now, we get another partial answer to Problem C.

**Theorem 3.4.** *If  $X \times 2^\kappa$  is subnormal, then  $X$  is collectionwise subnormal.*

Since collectionwise  $\delta$ -normal and submetacompact spaces are subparacompact [Ju3], Theorems 1.4 and 3.3 yields a partial answer to Problems B and C.

**Corollary 3.5.** *For a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X$  is subparacompact.
- (b)  $X \times \gamma X$  is subnormal and suborthocompact.
- (c)  $X \times 2^\kappa$  is subnormal and suborthocompact.

#### 4. LINDELÖF SPACES

Recall that a space  $X$  is  $\omega_1$ -compact if every closed discrete subset in  $X$  is at most countable. Note that Lindelöf spaces are  $\omega_1$ -compact.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $C$  be a countably compact space and  $X$  a subspace of  $C$ . If the subspace  $(X \times C) \cup (C \times X)$  of the square  $C^2$  is subnormal, then  $X$  is  $\omega_1$ -compact.*

Using this, we can obtain an analogous characterization of Lindelöf spaces to Tamano's theorem for paracompactness (see Theorem 1.2).

**Theorem 4.2.** *For a Tychonoff space  $X$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X$  is Lindelöf.
- (b) The subspace  $(X \times \gamma X) \cup (\gamma X \times X)$  of the square  $(\gamma X)^2$  is normal.
- (c)  $X$  is submetacompact and the subspace  $(X \times \gamma X) \cup (\gamma X \times X)$  of the square  $(\gamma X)^2$  is subnormal.

In Theorem 4.2, we can find a kind of similarity to the form of Corollary 3.2.

## REFERENCES

- [A] A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ, *On bicompacta hereditarily satisfying Suslin condition. Tightness and free sequence* *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **12** (1971), 1253–1256.
- [C] J. Chaber, *On subparacompactness and related properties*, *General Topology and Appl.* **10** (1979), 13–17.
- [D] C. H. Dowker, *On countably paracompact spaces*, *Canad. J. Math.* **3** (1951), 219–224.
- [GT] C. Good and I. J. Tree, *On  $\delta$ -normality*, *Topology and Appl.* **56** (1994), 117–127.
- [HV] R.E.Hodel and J.E.Vaughan, *A note on  $[a, b]$ -compactness*, *General Topology and Appl.* **4** (1974), 179–189.
- [Ji] S. Jiang, *Every strict  $p$ -space is  $\theta$ -refinable*, *Topology Proc.* **11** (1986), 309–316.
- [Ju1] H. J. K. Junnila, *Metacompactness, paracompactness and interior-preserving open covers*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **249** (1979), 373–385.
- [Ju2] ———, *On submetacompactness*, *Topology Proc.* **3** (1978), 375–405.
- [Ju3] ———, *Three covering properties*, *Surveys in General Topology* (G.M.Reed, ed.), Academic Press, New York, 1980, pp. 195–245.
- [Ka] Y. Katuta, *Expandability and its generalizations*, *Fund. Math.* **87** (1975), 231–250.
- [Kr] T. R. Kramer, *A note on countably subparacompact spaces*, *Pacific J. Math.* **46** (1973), 209–213.
- [KY] N. Kemoto and Y. Yajima, *Orthocompactness and normality of products with a cardinal factor*, *Topology and Appl.* **49** (1993), 141–148.
- [M] K. Morita, *A note on paracompactness*, *Proc. Japan Acad.* **37** (1961), 1–3.
- [P] T. C. Przymusiński, *Products of normal spaces*, *Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology* (K. Kunen and J.E. Vaughan, eds), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 781–826.
- [R1] M. E. Rudin, *A normal space  $X$  for which  $X \times I$  is not normal*, *Fund. Math.* **73** (1971), 179–186.
- [R2] ———, *The normality of products with one compact factor*, *General Topology and Appl.* **5** (1975), 45–59.
- [S] B.M.Scott, *Toward a product theory of orthocompactness*, *Studies in Topology* (N.M.Stavrakas and K.R.Allen, ed.), Academic Press, New York, 1975, pp. 517–537.
- [SK] J. C. Smith and L. L. Krajewski, *Expandability and collectionwise normality*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **160** (1971), 437–451.
- [T] H. Tamano, *On compactifications*, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **1** (1962), 161–193.
- [Y1] Y. Yajima, *A characterizations of submetacompactness in terms of products*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **112** (1991), 291–296.
- [Y2] ———, *Characterizations of four covering properties by products*, *Topology and Appl.* **45** (1992), 119–130.